



## Woodford Neighbourhood Forum

c/o Woodford Community Centre, Chester Road, Woodford, Stockport, Cheshire, SK7 1PS

Email: [woodfordneighbourhood@gmail.com](mailto:woodfordneighbourhood@gmail.com)

Web: <http://woodfordnf.co.uk>

### Minutes of Meeting of Woodford Neighbourhood Forum Management Committee

Held via email during June 2020

#### Participants

EF, JC, RBB, JK, PR, JS, MW, ZJ, PG, RBu

#### Declaration of conflicts of interest

None

#### Email discussions

Email exchanges revealed several key issues needing a committee decision. A set of proposals was circulated for committee members to vote on as shown in the notes below. Comments made during and after the vote are also included.

#### 1. Approval of minutes of WNF meeting on 27 Feb 2020

The minutes had been circulated to the committee members.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** The minutes of 27<sup>th</sup> Feb 2020 are approved.

Agree: JC, PG, JK, ZJ, RBB, PR, RB, TB (8)

Disagree:

No comment: EF, MW

Comments:

MW: I wasn't present at the meeting

JS: - I have a note regarding Tameside are setting up forums but may not be important

- I have a note that a nice letter re comments to be out on the website and SMBC asked to make it clear that our policies are out there.

EF: Answer to Jane's points. I didn't send a separate letter, but included a note to say we were particularly disappointed that WNP had not been referred to in the Flora Cottage PA given that the applicant had discussed the PA with SMBC planning officers. As there is now a lull in PAs coming in, I could draft a separate letter, if we think it would be useful to push that point a bit more.

EF we should also record that we were notified by JDV that Dorothy Chesterman had died.

The team expressed shock and sadness at the news.

#### Actions:

- EF to bring forward an action to highlight to SMBC the lack of reference in PAs to WNP policies, which can be found on the SMBC and WNF websites.
- EF to add note about our sadness at the the news of death of DC to the minutes.

## **2. Meetings during the Covid-19 emergency**

Options discussed included email, Zoom or group of six in a garden. Email was the most popular option.

Discussion included accessibility and reliability of video conference facilities, and need to ensure that the quorum rules (one third of the committee) were followed. It was suggested that email was okay, provided that one third of the committee participated in the voting.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** During lockdown we will hold meetings via email.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

**Action:** EF to set up meetings via email until such time as we can meet again.

## **3. Website style**

JC had updated the WNF website during April and used a different style and software (Elementor for Wordpress). JC was thanked for her efforts. In the past there have been two committee members able to edit the website: JC and EF. JC was showing EF how to use the new software in order to restore this situation.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** The updated website style is approved.

Agree: EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (10)

Disagree:

No comment: JC

**Action:** EF and JC to work together on editing tutorials.

## **4. WNF responses to PAs**

There had been discussion about the workload and the style of response, focussing on assessing against WNP policies and including assessment against Local Plan and NPPF policies where appropriate.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** Committee will continue to respond to PAs as we are doing and review workload after 12 months at (i.e. end July 2020).

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

Comments:

JS: Yes (it is already on the website)?

EF: Answer to Jane's point. Yes, it has been approved by several of us and is on the website, but I put it in here so that approval is recorded in minutes of a formal meeting.

**Action:** EF and JK to continue to respond to PAs as we are doing, taking account of comments from committee members.

#### **5. PA table on website**

JC had prepared a table of the planning applications that had been sent to WNF as consultee. The table included a link to the PA on the SMBC website, WNF response and the SMBC decision with Appeal result where applicable.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** The table of Planning Applications is approved for public view/circulation.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

#### **6. Updating the PA table**

There was a discussion about the frequency of updated the table. As the frequency of new planning applications is variable it was agreed that no specific timetable should be set, but it would be update regularly when needed.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** We will update the PA table on the website on a regular basis.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

**Action:** JC to update the table on the website at regular intervals when needed.

#### **7. Notification about PA table**

There was a discussion about notifying members and other residents about the addition of the table to the website. EF had drafted a proposed email which appeared at the bottom of the voting sheet.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** We will circulate an email (see below for who are the recipients) providing the link to the table on the website and saying that the table will be updated regularly.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

**Action:** EF to circulate email via mailchimp (as set up by JC see item 18).

#### **8. Contact information on website**

In the email discussion it was noted that the WNF email address was not provided on the website at the time. JC had explained that this was for security reasons because publishing your email address on a website makes is open to abuse. It would be easily added. EF had

suggested that alternatively the sign up table could be made more visible. JC had suggested that a link rather than the actual address could be provided. A trial period to assess the impact on unwanted mail was discussed.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** A link to the WNF email address will appear on the website on the Contact US page for a trial period of one month while we assess the impact on the inbox.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (10)

Disagree: JS

No comment:

Comments:

EF: Yes. It is important for people to be able to contact us easily. Some people don't want to complete a form, so the link is ideal for them.

PG: I don't see it causing any problems and it makes it easier to make contact

JC: \*I def agree in principle but in these days of increased spam and scams I remain a bit concerned about disclosing the actual addy

JS: I think the form is good enough

**Action:** JC to include a link to the email address, in addition to the form, for a trial period.

## 9. Circulation lists

The spreadsheet of WNF contacts had been circulated to the committee. This included a number of categories of residents including:

- i. Committee members
- ii. Forum members

Non-members who constitute the following categories:

- iii. People who have signed up for updates since the forum began
- iv. Residents who responded to Regulation 14 and requested updates on the WNP
- v. Neighbours interested in Stockport Council updates.
- vi. Organisations who responded to Regulation 14 and requested updates on the WNP.
- vii. Developers, agents and landowners who responded to Regulation 14 and requested updates on the WNP.
- viii. People who responded to SMBC's Regulation 16 consultation (list supplied by SMBC).

EF explained that she selected the appropriate recipients according to the content of the message, by simply copying and pasting from appropriate columns in the spreadsheet into the blind copy section of an email, which was quick to achieve. In the past, the majority of messages went to members only. Non-members were included in occasional updates. The few people who responded to regulation 16, but were not in any other list, had never been contacted because we believed that to be SMBC's consultation.

PG raised the questions of whether all of these contacts, except Forum members, should now be archived, because they related specifically to Plan development; and what type of messages WNF should be circulating at this stage. A discussion via email followed.

This gave rise to two options shown in items 10 and 11 below.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** We will archive all contacts in our circulation list, except WNF members and our

advisors.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

**Action:** EF to archive all non-member contact details.

### **10. WNF becomes a members-only organisation**

There was a discussion about becoming a members-only organisation from now on.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet, which highlighted that either option 10 or 11 had to be chosen, if the voter agreed with number 10, then they could not agree with number 11:

**Proposal:** We will no longer hold a mailing list of non-members and the option to “subscribe to our mailing list” will be deleted from the website.

Agree: PG, RBB, TB (3)

Disagree: EF, JC, JS, MW, PR (5)

No comment: JK

Comments:

PG: I agree. Lists such as this go out of date very quickly and only make contact with random people. We should instead encourage these people to join the Forum if they wish to be contacted.

EF: I disagree. I was thinking we would have to do this at one point, but then realised that renewed opt-in is a way around it. Some people wish to be kept informed, but do not want to be members. The mailing list gives us a wider reach into the community.

JS: I think you need a record of those that commented on the plan for historical purposes with our comments retained so that not one can challenge the way the plan.

MW: Although I think non-members should be encouraged to join WNF.

EF: we have a detailed table of responses to Regulation 14 in Appendix D to the Consultation Statement. I have their contact details stored separately in a spreadsheet, which can be archived. Any non-member contact details stored in Google mail can be deleted for GDPR safety.

### **11. WNF allows subscription to a new non-members mailing list**

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** We will retain the option to subscribe to our mailing list on the website and invite all our existing contacts (excluding organisations, developers and Regulation 16) to subscribe if they wish (seems only fair if we are inviting new ones).

Agree: JC, EF, JS, ZJ, MW, PR, RB (7)

Disagree:

No comment: JK

Comments:

EF: Yes. It is a pity to lose all our contacts built up over 7 years without giving them the chance to stay on our mailing list. They should be given the chance to opt in again to this new phase in our role. I would not include developers and agents because they do not live or work here, but will understand if others think it would be wrong to exclude them.

JC: Agree

JS: One off email to invite them to be members to get the information as per draft email.

**Action:** Retain the option to subscribe to our new mailing list on the website

### **12. Membership of the Forum**

There was a discussion about inviting new members into the forum. It was agreed that they would be welcome.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** Residents in the neighbourhood area and people who work in Woodford can still join the neighbourhood forum and we retain the form on the website to complete for anyone wishing to join.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

Comments:

JC: Yes, I think this is particularly important.

EF: A couple of thoughts in the light of the votes:

Currently on the website there is a form to subscribe to the mailing list on Home Page and also on the Contact Us page. A Join Us form appears on the Contact Us page, but not on the Home Page

Given that we are all in favour of encouraging residents to join the Forum, should we replace the Subscribe to Mailing List form with the Join Us form on the Home Page? That still would leave the option to subscribe to mailing list on the Contact Us page. What do we think?

**Action:** Retain the option to join the forum on the website.

### **13. Public service messages**

There was a discussion about public service emails, such as green bin timetables, which had been sent out to WNF circulation list mainly during the Covid-19 emergency. It was generally thought that this was the remit of WCC and WNF should restrict itself to planning issues.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet, which noted that options 13, 14 and 15 were mutually exclusive, so the voter could only agree with one.

**Proposal:** WNF ceases to circulate public service messages and we leave that to WCC.

Agree: JC, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, RB, TB (9)

Disagree: EF, PR (2)

No comment:

Comments:

EF: I disagree. I was favouring this at one point, but have changed my mind because it is very little trouble. See response to option 15.

PG: I agree - the Forum has a single purpose to prepare and monitor a development plan and should only maintain a data base of e mails for that purpose, ie Forum Members. I'm not sure that a data base collected for Forum purposes should be used for other types of communication. Any other circulation should be done by WCC.

JS: Yes, WCC is already providing that information (although I do warm my family re roadworks!)

PR: Planning only is a valid point to control work load and concentrate efforts and limited resources, but in the end some messages need getting out to residents by all means possible, so I think the option should be there at the managements committee`s discretion

EF: Notes following the debate. I still think the WNF constitution covers us for circulating general information in an emergency situation, such as Covid-19, as an addition to WCC newsletter and they may reach different audiences (WCC recipients are unknown to the WCC committee). However, I am very happy for WNF to stop doing it. It is not a big issue and there must be some duplication. Also neither WNF nor WCC messages about bin collections seemed to be assimilated by residents anyway.

**Action:** WNF will cease to circulate public service messages.

**14. Proposal: WNF continues to circulate public service messages, but to WNF members only.** (Alternative proposal)

Agree:

Disagree: EF, JC, JS, RBB, TB

No comment:

Comments:

PG: I disagree – any e mails, even to Forum members should only be about planning.

JK: No - there are other routes to do this so WNF can concentrate on Planning matters

JS: Not WNF remit

**15. Proposal: WNF continues to circulate public service messages to members and wider mailing list of newly opted-in subscribers.** (Alternative proposal)

The voting sheet noted that this could only apply if option 11 was chosen.

Agree: EF, PR, ZJ (3)

Disagree: JS (1)

No comment:

Comments:

EF: Yes. These messages are very little trouble to write and the selected circulation list is put into blind copy by the click of a button (whether by current method or mailchimp). They reach people who are not signed up to receive WCC newsletter and it is a very small thing we can do to help during the Covid-19 crisis. We could have a standard bit at the bottom

with links to WNF and WCC websites to raise awareness of both.

JC: I think that if someone wishes to receive any communication from WNF then that person should join WNF. Without looking carefully at the Constitution I'm not sure we can say that but at the very least I feel they should be "encouraged" shall we say to join WNF. I think also with a WWMCC hat on (I will run it past the committee) that WWMCC includes a link to both WNF and WCC at the foot of its emails in future.

JS: I think a one off email is enough.

RBB: Didn't choose option 11, so not applicable.

MW: I think WCC should circulate public service messages in their newsletters but maybe include links to WNF & WWMCC websites to capture a wider audience.

RB: I think WCC should circulate public service messages in their newsletters but maybe include links to WNF & WWMCC websites to capture a wider audience.

### **16. Newsletters**

The idea of a WNF newsletter and the number of community newsletters from other organisations had been discussed. It was generally felt that a regular WNF newsletter was not needed because any key WNF news is reported in the WCC newsletter.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** We will not produce a WNF newsletter, but circulate updates about PA table, local plans etc to agreed circulation list, when appropriate, via email.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, ZJ, JS, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

Comments:

EF: Yes. WCC newsletter covers anything for general consumption.

JK: Yes. Focus should be on Planning

### **17. WCC Newsletter**

This proposal was included to formally approve the inclusion of WNF news in the WCC newsletter.

The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** WNF news may be included in the WCC newsletters.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

Comments:

PG: WCC newsletter covers anything for general consumption.

JK: Yes, as 16

JS: Yes. WCC newsletter covers anything for general consumption.

### **18. Use of mailchimp to circulate emails**

JC and EF explained that this system was in common use, had some advantages over other



email systems and is GDPR compliant. EF noted that WNF members had been asked for positive opt-in when GDPR regulations changed and all messages had an opt-out of further emails option. The current system sends to all selected recipients with a click of a button, so is equally convenient, but mailchimp may look nicer and includes other facilities for assessing website viewing. Mailchimp is an American marketing automation platform and email marketing service. Wikipedia explains: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mailchimp>. The following notes were recorded on the voting sheet:

**Proposal:** Use of mailchimp is approved to send messages.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

Comments:

JC: I think there are certain occasional types of “messages/news” that would really lend themselves to the use of mailchimp – imo the news of the PA table being one of them.

### **19. Annual Monitoring Report**

There was an email exchange over whether it was WNF’s or SMBC’s responsibility to produce a monitoring report. Some internet searches suggested the latter. However, JK provided the following information: Locality have some useful documents for monitoring including one called After the Neighbourhood Plan – follow the link

<https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/how-to-implement-monitor-and-review-your-made-neighbourhood-plan/>

**Proposal:** We will produce an Annual Monitoring Report for presentation at the AGM.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, MW, PR, RB, TB (10)

Disagree:

No comment:

Comments:

RBB: I believe we should not make this decision until we know what is involved

EF: We can work with John while there is a lull in new PAs to start structuring the contents, following Locality guidelines.

### **20. Timing of the Annual Monitoring Report**

There was an email discussion about whether to start now or wait until we know who should do it and what is involved because internet searches raised some doubt about whose task it was, until JK later clarified.

**Proposal:** The Annual Monitoring Report will be circulated to members prior to the AGM.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, MW, PR, RB, TB (10)

Disagree:

No comment:

Comments:

EF: Yes. I think it would be unwise and stressful to leave it until the last minute. In addition, it will give members chance to absorb the information before the meeting and think about any questions they may have. We may not be able to hold a public meeting, but that may have changed by September.

JK: Yes. May also be worth sending to local councillors, MP and SMBC

RBB: As for 19

PR: Yes, I also agree with JK re extended circulation and would add WCC/WWMCC and other local NF's

### **21. Village Aspirations**

It had been clear that all committee members were keen to keep this as a high profile and initiate projects.

**Proposal:** It remains on the WNF agenda as a joint venture with WCC, but WCC is the best organisation to lead the way now.

Agree: JC, EF, PG, JK, JS, ZJ, RBB, MW, PR, RB, TB (11)

Disagree:

No comment:

Other comments:

PG: I think that the Village Aspirations should be re-examined by WCC. Time has passed and some have been carried already. WCC should consider if there are new ones and monitor the Redrow conditions some of which start to kick in after specified numbers of completions.

JK: Yes. Need to update and review

PR: Yes, but perhaps needs a small team to look into progressing this who are not committed directly to PA reviews.

### **22. AOB**

#### **Bridle Road Appeal**

EF: I sent an email to Emma Curle accepting the offer of a video call but she had not replied. I assume that the offer has been withdrawn.

JS: Did the email 7<sup>th</sup> May go out to the residents with regards to any appeal?

EF: Answer to Jane's question. Yes it went to Jonathan Margolis, John Meare and Kate Wardle-Davies. They all replied saying that they had sent their emails to Emma Curle. Last week Kate Wardle Davies asked if we had heard anything because they had heard nothing from the council's about their intentions.

PR: After recent issues of interpretation of our current WNP (land nr Windy Ridge) perhaps we can issue a concise guidance note re our interpretation of our policy. (if this is permitted) (or some form of 5 year review etc to address any anomalies that have arisen from the policy's use in practice.)

#### **GMSF**

This message from the SGMGB Hon Sec was posted on Facebook on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2020:

*Message from GMCA today to SGMGB - Following the question on the GMSF at today's Mayors Press Conference this statement has been released by GMCA which reinforces what*

*the Mayor said:*

*"The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) is a strategic plan for the whole city-region, and is part of a shared commitment to ensuring that growth benefits all of our people and places.*

*The coronavirus pandemic has already had a significant impact on the local economy, and its effects on employment and housing are likely to be felt for some time. For this reason, it is essential that any plan recognises and responds to these new circumstances. Acknowledging these circumstances will be vital to ensuring that Greater Manchester is prepared for the challenges that lay ahead, and that we seize the opportunity to build back in a way that's better and fairer for all.*

*Our focus is on getting the right plan in place, and a revised timescale for consultation will be published as soon as possible."*

### **SGMGB**

EF: Working with core members of SGMGB to produce a revised and improved constitution.

### **Friends of the Earth meetings on planning**

Friends of the Earth ran a series of Zoom meetings where a panel of planning experts gave presentation and answered questions, with the aim of educating the public. EF had signed up and had missed them all but was intending to participate in a meeting dedicated to GMSF. There was an option to submit questions in advance. Marj Powner (Carrington Moss rep) and Peter Burns (Heald Green rep) were intending to participate. Our questions submitted in advance included:

2014 v 2016 ONS figs; 19 year v 15 year plan period; inclusion of windfall sites; will the evidence base need updating after so long in preparation; what will be the influence of the Mayor if it goes forward as a joint development plan rather than a strategy development plan?

### **Proposed changes in planning**

An article in the Sunday Times about discussions about proposed reforms has been reported in social media. (circulated)

EF reported that these are causing concern among members of SGMGB.

### **Area Committee Meeting**

The next Area Committee meeting will be held on Thu 18 June. It will discuss 141 Woodford Road PA, DC/076101. Officers have recommended approval. The Agenda is on the [website](#)

The Reports Pack refers to WNP:

"Woodford Neighbourhood Plan

ENV3 Protecting Woodford's Natural Features ENV4 Supporting Biodiversity DEV4 Design of New Development"

"Objections from WNF that the redevelopment of this backland site would be contrary to policy DEV4 are noted. The policy however does not preclude backland development (irrespective of how many residents are opposed to such development) but rather requires development to reflect and respond to the rural character of the Area. Despite falling within the plan area, the application site is of different character to much of the Woodford area. As described above the area within with the

site is located has much more a suburban character to it and is markedly different to the vast majority of the Woodford Plan area which is very rural in its character. The Council's SPD does not preclude backland or infill development but rather highlights the issues that may be of concern and which need particular consideration. Through the submission of an indicative layout, it is considered that the application demonstrates that a detached dwelling could be accommodated on the site without harm to either the character of the area or the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policies H1, CS8 and SIE1 of the Core Strategy DPD, DEV4 of the WNP and advice contained in the NPPF."

Evelyn Frearson 8<sup>th</sup> July 2020